

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2005

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,323	07/17/2003	Sze Tan	6033-019	4328
75	90 09/22/2005		EXAMINER	
John F. Schipper, Esq. Suite 808			ROSENBERGER, RICHARD A	
111 N. Market Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
San Jose, CA 95113			2877	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		\mathcal{N}	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/622,323	TAN ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Richard A. Rosenberger	2877	
The MAILING DATE of this communication	appears on the cover sheet wi	h the correspondence address	
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFI after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the m earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ODATE OF THIS COMMUNIC R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON atute, cause the application to become AB	ATION. ply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
	This action is non-final.		
Since this application is in condition for allocation accordance with the practice und	wance except for formal matte		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ⊠ Claim(s) 29-46,48 and 49 is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-4 and 47 is/are rejected. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) 5-28 is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction are	drawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to the drawing(s) be held in abeyan rrection is required if the drawing	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in A priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

Application/Control Number: 10/622,323 Page 2

Art Unit: 2877

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the

manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr et

al (US 2003/0189711).

technique that included smoothing the oscillatory part of the ringdown decay with a low-pass

As in claims 1 and 4, and 47, Orr et al teaches, one page 10, column 1, lines 1-9, a

filter, noting that such smoothing can contribute rapidly and accurately deriving the ringdown

time. Orr does not teach the claimed bandwidth characteristic of the low-pass filter used to

smooth the signal; leaving the selection of the particular filter with particular filter characteristics

suitable for the smoothing to the ordinary skill of those in the art. The instant specification, in the

paragraph bridging page 6, presents the choice of filter characteristics as the kind of engineering

tradeoff commonly made in all the engineering arts, balancing the undesired effects of having a

bandwidth that is too high against the undesired effects of having it too low. Thus it appears from

the instant specification that the claimed bandwidth, although characterized in a manner not used

in the cited art, nevertheless is within the range of filters which those, in choosing a filter for the

system of Orr et al, using ordinary skill and ordinary engineering design practice, would choose.

Orr et la noted (page 6, column 2, in paragraph [0104], that it is known to use an A/D converter to convert a detected signal into a corm suitable for analysis. While the reference does not specifically teach that the A/D converter is operated to sample the signal uniformly over time, this is the most usual and standard manner of operating an A/D converter and is such a well-known manner of operating an A/D converter that official notice is sufficient.

Orr et al notes that the system can use "computer fitting" (page 10, column 2, line 9), which at least clearly suggests :suing a curve fitting method" as claimed.

As in claims 2 and 3, both analog and digital filters, and their use to filter signals, is so well known official notice is sufficient.

3. The art of record does not teach or suggest the claimed estimating the ringdown time by averaging the time separation of data points which differ in value by a predetermined ratio; thus claim 5 and the claims dependent therefrom (6-8, and 15-28), and claim 10, and claims dependent therefrom (11-12) contain allowable subject matter, as do claims 29 and 39, and claims 30-38 and 40-46 as dependent therefrom, and claims 48 and 48.

The art does not teach or suggest searching for a trigger data points in the manner of claim 9 and claims dependent therefrom (claims 10-14), which therefor contain allowable subject matter.

Thus Claims 29-46 and 48-49 are allowable and claims 5-28 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of their respective parent claims.

Art Unit: 2877

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard A Rosenberger whose telephone number is (571) 272-2428. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday during the hours of 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory J. Toatley, Jr. can be reached on (571) 272-2800 ext. 77. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

R. A. Rosenberger 19 September 2005

Richard A. Rosenberger Primary Examiner